United States Government

Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: August 19, 2003

REPLY TO KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-117)

то: Peter Lofy

Fish and Wildlife Project Manager – KEWL-4

Proposed Action: Umatilla River Basin Anadromous Fish Habitat Enhancement Project – Stroud Creek

Stabilization

Project No: 1987-100-01

Watershed Management Techniques or Actions Addressed Under This Supplement Analysis (See App. A of the Watershed Management Program EIS):

- 1.8 Bank protection through vegetation management
- 2.1 Maintain healthy riparian plant communities
- 2.7 Avoid exotic species
- 3.1 Plant/protect vegetative/conservation cover
- 6.14 Vegetation stabilization: Critical area planting
- 6.15 Vegetation stabilization: Brush/weed management

Location: Umatilla River, Umatilla Indian Reservation

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: The proposed project is a streambank stabilization project. The landowner has signed a conservation easement to protect the riparian area in perpetuity. Under this agreement, the CTUIR proposes to stablize the eroding streambank. During implementation of the proposed project, the vertical streambank will be contoured and seeded with native grass species. Willow and cottonwood cuttings and bareroot native species will be planted along the streambank. Weeds will be controlled to allow native plants to establish themselves.

<u>Analysis</u>: The compliance checklist for this project was completed by Amy Sexton, CTUIR Fish Habitat Biologist, and meets the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD).

Pursuant to its obligation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, BPA requested species lists and fulfilled its section 7 consultation requirements. Listed species that were determined to be potentially present in the project area included: Canada lynx, bald eagle, bull trout, mid-Columbia River steelhead, and proposed critical habitat for bull trout. On May 22, 2003, BPA determined that this proposed project would have no effect on those species under the jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildife Service. For species under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries, informal consultation was completed and concurrence was obtained on June 19, 2003, concluding that the proposed project would not likely adversely affect mid-Columbia River steelhead nor Essential Fish Habitat.

Pursuant to obligations under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a cultural resource survey was completed by the CTUIR on September 5, 2001. The survey located several isolated finds and it was proposed that the project proceed with the presence of a cultural resource monitor. The Tribal Historic Preservation Office of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation concurred with this conclusion, on June 18, 2003.

Permits for the proposed project are required from the CTUIR and the US Army Corps of Engineers. The CTUIR Tribal Stream Zone Alteration Permit has been received and the Section 404 permit from the Corps has been approved and is forthcoming. No work will proceed until all necessary permits are acquired.

Programmatic outreach activities have been coordinated with landowners, special interest groups, and agency personel, assisting in obtaining public input. This relatively small-scale project was included as part of the programmatic outreach effort. As part of this effort, the CTUIR has coordinated with Oregon Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Umatilla SWCDM Natural Resource Conservation Service, and the Umatilla Watershed Council.

Findings: The project is generally consistent with the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, as well as BPA's Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265) and ROD. This Supplement Analysis finds that: 1) implementing the proposed action will not result in any substantial changes to the Watershed Management Program that are relevant to environmental concerns; and 2) there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Watershed Management Program or its impacts. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

DATE: 8-19-03

<u>/s/ Michael Mayer 8-19-03</u> Michael S. Mayer Fish and Wildlife Biologist

CONCUR:

Thomas C. McKinney NEPA Compliance Officer

/s/ Thomas McKinney

Attachments: NEPA Checklist TPHO Concurrence Letter No Effect Determination for USFWS ESA Species NOAA ESA Concurrence Letter

cc: (w/ attachments) Mr. Todd Shaw- CTUIR